THEOLOGY

VOL. XLVI JUNE, 1943 No. 276

Editorial Notes

OWING to the greatly reduced size of THEOLOGY at present, an index will be supplied only once a year, and not at the end of each six months. The next index will be supplied in December.

This year is the centenary of the Scottish Disruption, and we are glad to be able to publish a comparative study of the relations between Church and State in England and Scotland. Mr Stevenson's article in this number will be followed by a sequel next month. We would also recommend Professor Hugh Watt's *Thomas Chalmers and the Disruption* (Nelson, 12s. 6d.), which combines a biography of Chalmers with an adequate history of the circumstances that led to the Disruption. The story is of absorbing interest simply as that of an extraordinary, and in some respects unparalleled, episode in ecclesiastical history; but in retrospect it seems to be charged with an even greater significance than appeared at the time. It was an earnest of the Church and State conflicts which have become all too familiar in our own time. It is a notification (if notification be needed) that Governments of Great Britain are not altogether exempt from the tendency to encroach upon the rights of the Church—indeed, that they have ample precedent for doing so.

On the other hand, Mr Stevenson's articles will show that, while the desire to secure for the Established Church of England the same freedom as is now enjoyed by the Established Church of Scotland may be laudable, it is not practicable. Few can suppose that the present relations between Church and State in England are ideal, or that they can continue indefinitely. The hope that a solution may be found by reproducing in England the relations that now exist in Scotland does not pass examination, however much we may wish that it did.

Churchmen in England, especially those who flirt with the prospect of Disestablishment, are often "Voluntaries" at heart, if they are not so unashamedly. They would have no quarrel on grounds of principle with this statement by Mr A. L. Rowse: "The proper place for churches in the modern community is as free and voluntary associations for those who want that sort of thing, and those who want it paying for it."[1] They do not see that the right ground of objection to the present form of Establishment in England is not that it is an Establishment, but that it is a bad kind of Establishment. The ground on which Chalmers and the Fathers of the Scottish Disruption departed from the Established Church was, as the following declaration shows, quite

[1] *Horizon* (June, 1941), p. 388.

different from that on which many Anglicans to-day aspire after Disestablishment. It also explains why within less than a century, and without inconsistency, the Free Church of Scotland was able to unite again with the Established Church.

> The Voluntaries mistake us, if they conceive us to be Voluntaries. We hold by the duty of Government to give of their resources and their means for the maintenance of a gospel ministry in the land; and we pray that their eyes may be opened, so that they may learn how to acquit themselves as the protectors of the Church, and not as its corruptors or its tyrants. . . . That is to say, though we quit the Establishment, we go out on the Establishment principle; we quit a vitiated Establishment, but would rejoice in returning to a pure one. To express it otherwise—we are the advocates for a national recognition and national support of religion—and we are not Voluntaries.[1]

In that case it is not right to say, as the Archbishop of Canterbury was recently reported to have said, that "the Church as such ought not to be interested in the question of establishment one way or the other."[2]

Church and State in England and Scotland—I

If one studies the recent ecclesiastical history of England and of Scotland it is impossible not to be impressed by the fact that two events of the greatest importance occurred in both countries at approximately the same time. It is more than a coincidence that the year 1833, in which Keble delivered the sermon on National Apostasy which inaugurated the Oxford Movement, saw in Scotland the first stages of the so-called Ten Years' Conflict which led to the Disruption of 1843. At that time there had arisen simultaneously in the minds of many Christians on both sides of the border a new appreciation of the Church as a holy society, entitled to demand that the State should recognize its liberty in matters of doctrine, worship, government and discipline, and relax the bonds which had been accepted during the Erastian eighteenth century by all but a few. Great as were the doctrinal differences between the Oxford Movement and the movement which led the followers of Dr Chalmers to leave the Established Church of Scotland at the call of conscience, the two movements had much in common. The founders of the Free Church, like the Tractarians, had a lofty conception of the Church as the Body of Christ and the chosen instrument of the Holy Spirit; they were prepared to make any sacrifice in order to secure freedom from the bonds imposed on them by the subjection of their branch of the Church to the authority of the State.

It is a second and equally striking coincidence that within a few years of the close of the last war the Government was approached by both the Church of England and the Church of Scotland with a request for legislation which should secure from the State some recognition of the liberty of the Church in matters which it regarded

[1] Chalmers' opening address at the first General Assembly of the Free Church of Scotland; quoted by Watt, *op. cit.*, p. 306.

[2] *Sunday Times*, November 15, 1942.

as spiritual. In 1919, by the Enabling Act, the Church of England obtained the right to create the machinery by which expression could be given to its wishes as a Church. Two years later Parliament conferred on the Church of Scotland, which already possessed the necessary machinery in its General Assembly and Presbyteries, a liberty in spiritual matters far greater than it had been prepared to grant to the Church of England. For what reasons, we may ask, did Parliament feel justified in conferring on the Church of Scotland, without depriving it of its status as an Established Church, privileges which, as the unfortunate events of 1927-8 were to show, were denied to the Church of England, and which can well be regarded with envy even by so-called Free Churches?

In the discussion of this subject which forms part of the Report of the Archbishops' Commission on Church and State, statements are made which to anyone even superficially acquainted with the ecclesiastical history of Scotland must seem ludicrous exaggerations. It is stated that: "In the principles embodied in the Act of 1921 there is nothing which had not been claimed and *explicitly allowed* in the previous history of the Scottish Church." Or again: "The spiritual autonomy of the Scottish Church had long been *unequivocally recognized*, and no change was required in order to secure it." One would imagine that the writer of these words had never heard of the Covenanters, of the Seceders, of the Disruption, and of the judgment of the House of Lords in 1904 against the United Free Church.

It is indeed true that from the time of John Knox the Church of Scotland, except during the brief periods when it abandoned Presbyterianism, has by means of its democratic constitution been enabled to exercise *de facto* an authority which almost justifies the words I have quoted, and to claim a spiritual liberty to which it was not legally entitled. It will be remembered how Andrew Melville walked uninvited into Falkland Palace and said to King James: "Sir, as divers times before, so now again I must tell you that there are two kings and two kingdoms in Scotland. There is Jesus Christ the King and His Kingdom the Kirk, whose subject King James VI is and of whose kingdom not a king, not a lord, not a head, but a member." Can one imagine Cranmer using such language to Henry VIII?

It is interesting to note that at the Reformation the thing which was first settled in England was the Royal Supremacy, while in Scotland it was the nature of the reformed faith. If Scotland had in the sixteenth century been ruled by a king as powerful and despotic as Henry VIII the whole ecclesiastical history of the country might well have been different. As it was, the Government was too weak to stand up against opposition whether it arose from the nobility or from masterful ecclesiastics like Knox and Melville. When, as sometimes happened, the nobility and the ecclesiastics combined, the king had no alternative but to yield. James I and VI attempted to establish Episcopacy, but the attempt had to be abandoned, and in 1592 the Presbyterian system was recognized by an Act of the Scottish Parliament. By this Act very considerable powers were conferred on the General Assembly and on the Church Courts, but these powers fell

far short of those which the Act of 1921 has granted to the Church of Scotland of to-day.

It is unnecessary to say much of the turbulent history of the Scottish Church in the seventeenth century. Between 1610 and 1638 its form of government was episcopalian, and if Scottish ecclesiastical affairs had been more tactfully handled by the Stuarts and their advisers it is possible that it would never have reverted to Presbyterianism. But the high-handed manner in which Laud enforced his Prayer Book and Charles II dealt with the Covenanters and other "recusants" created a prejudice against "prelacy" which rendered the establishment of Presbyterianism after the Revolution of 1688 practically inevitable. In the seventeenth century the Scottish Church had no desire for spiritual freedom in the modern sense of the term. It was perfectly happy that its doctrine, organization and forms of worship should be determined by Act of Parliament, and it admitted that decisions of the General Assembly on those subjects required parliamentary confirmation. In 1645, for instance, the "Directory for Public Worship" was sanctioned by Parliament, and in 1649 Parliament ratified the adoption by the General Assembly of the Confession of Faith. These ratifications were cancelled after the Restoration, but under the Revolution Settlement the Westminster Confession and the presbyterian form of Church government were authorized by Act of Parliament. In 1690 the Westminster Confession received parliamentary sanction as the official statement of the doctrine of the Church of Scotland exactly as under Charles II the Prayer Book had been sanctioned for the Church of England. The control exercised by the State over the Church was just as rigid in Scotland as it was in England. Any departure from the authorized formularies of faith and worship was illegal without the consent of Parliament. The main difference between the two countries lay in the fact that the Church of Scotland was fortunate in possessing and retaining a General Assembly, consisting of both clergy and laity, strong enough to bring pressure to bear on the Government, whereas in the Anglican Church the meetings of Convocation were suspended from 1717 till 1847 and the only official mouthpieces of the Church were individual bishops, who themselves were nominees of the Government.

Though on the whole the settlement of 1690 worked well during the eighteenth century, considerable resentment was caused by the action of Parliament in 1712 in reintroducing Lay Patronage, which had been abolished at the Revolution. This is a subject on which feeling in Scotland has always been strong. No minister is ordained until he has received a "call" from a definite congregation, and the members of the congregation feel resentment if their wishes in the matter have not at least been consulted. It is true that even after the passing of the Act of 1712 the concurrence of the congregation was required, but this concurrence was gradually reduced to a mere formality. This situation led to more than one Secession in the course of the eighteenth century, but it is a mistake to suppose that these Secessions were due to the Patronage question alone. The Seceders protested not only against the action of patrons in overriding the

wishes of the parishioners but against the lax theology of the so-called Moderates, who dominated the Church. The cry "We have a right to hear the Gospel" was inextricably blended with the cry "We have the right to choose our own ministers." The Seceders of the eighteenth century, like the Evangelicals of the nineteenth who left the Church of Scotland in 1843, objected to Patronage less for its own sake than as a symbol of other tendencies to which they were opposed.

The controversy which led to the Disruption of 1843 made it abundantly clear that under the existing arrangements with the State the liberty of the Church of Scotland was rigidly limited. The trouble first arose over the old question of Patronage, but before long much wider issues were raised. In 1834 the General Assembly, in which the Evangelicals had a majority, passed the so-called "Veto Act," which conferred on congregations the right to veto any presentation to a living of which they disapproved. The legality of this action was challenged in the civil courts, to which application was made by nominees whom the congregations had rejected and who had therefore been refused institution by the presbyteries. With practical unanimity both the Court of Session and the House of Lords decided that the Veto Act was *ultra vires* and that presbyteries were legally bound to ordain men who had been nominated by patrons, whether or not they were welcome to their parishioners. Individual judges used very strong language on the subject. "That our Saviour," said Lord President Hope, "is the Head of the Kirk of Scotland, in any temporal or legislative or judicial sense, is a position which I can dignify by no other name than absurdity. The Parliament is the temporal head of the Church, from whose Acts, and from whose Acts alone, it exists as the National Church, and from which alone it derives all its powers." "The Scottish Legislature," said Lord Cunningham, "gave only the most limited power to the Kirk. It prescribed its creed, fixed the constitution of the ecclesiastical bodies, and conferred on Church Courts the very limited powers legally possessed by them."

When the legal situation had been made clear, attempts were made to have it altered by legislation, but without result. None of the proposals made by sympathizers in Parliament to legalize the policy of the Veto Act were able to obtain adequate support. A final attempt to avoid disaster was made in 1843 when the so-called Claim of Right, which had been passed in the General Assembly by 241 votes to 110, was brought before the House of Commons. This document stated that the Church had no other Head than Jesus Christ, and that the civil magistrate had no authority in matters spiritual. It claimed "as of right" that the Church should freely possess and enjoy all liberties, government, discipline, rights and privileges according to law. The proposal that this somewhat rhetorical document should be favourably considered was rejected decisively by 211 votes to 76, after a debate in which Sir Robert Peel had expressed the view that "even in the times that preceded the Reformation the Church of Rome never laid claim to a greater power than that involved in the claims now set up." "It is a perfect anomaly and absurdity," he said, "that a Church should have all the privileges of an Establishment, and yet

claim an exemption from those obligations which, wherever there is an Establishment, must exist on its side with reference to the supreme tribunals of the country." "My firm belief," he continued, "is that those claims, if admitted on the part of the Church of Scotland, cannot be limited to their present extent or be confined to that Church."

The party led by Dr Chalmers probably made a tactical mistake in submitting to Parliament proposals of such a far-reaching character. If they had limited themselves to the question of Patronage it is certain that with a little patience a settlement would have been reached. Indeed, in the very same year (1843) a Bill was passed through Parliament conferring on congregations the right to make a protest against an unpopular presentee. But the fact that the Disruption occurred shows that much larger issues were at stake.

I may note in passing how close is the parallel between the situation I have described and the situation which arose in 1927 when the House of Commons refused to sanction the revised Prayer Book. On both occasions Parliament rejected a proposal which had been passed by a large majority in the legally constituted Assembly of the Church concerned, but was opposed by an influential minority whose views made an appeal to many outside the Church. On both occasions the adverse vote was due not so much to the actual proposals as to their implications.

In the half-century which followed the Disruption the "Auld Kirk" and the Free Kirk drifted far apart, and even when the Act of 1874 had abolished Private Patronage there was no talk of reunion. On the other hand, the Free Church seriously considered union with the United Presbyterian Church in which the various bodies which had seceded in the eighteenth century had been amalgamated in 1847. Not till 1900 was a union effected, and efforts to bring it about in the seventies came to nothing. A considerable section of the Free Church still hankered after a State connexion, while the U.P.s, as they were called, accepted the "Voluntary Principle" and regarded the so-called "Establishment Principle" as an evil. In the last quarter of the nineteenth century a vigorous movement for the disestablishment of the Church of Scotland sprang up, which found supporters not only among the U.P.s but in the Free Church. As a result, political feeling ran high. The Conservative Party supported the Auld Kirk, while, as in England, almost all dissenters belonged to the Liberal Party. When the union occurred in 1900 it was regarded without enthusiasm by Conservatives, who saw in it a strengthening of the movement for Disestablishment.

The opponents of the Union had certainly ground for sardonic satisfaction in the events which followed. The small minority within the Free Church who had objected to the movement challenged the legality of the Union in the civil courts. They were unsuccessful in Scotland, but when an Appeal was heard by the House of Lords in 1904 a majority, led by Lord Halsbury, reversed the judgment of the Court of Session and ruled that all the property of the former Free Church belonged to the dissidents, the so-called "Wee Frees."

This decision was greeted with glee in Conservative circles. The *Scotsman* began its leading article with the words: "Principal Rainy has tried to disestablish the Church of Scotland; he has ended by disestablishing his own." However, the situation created by the judgment was so intolerable that in 1905 a Bill was passed through Parliament authorizing a distribution of the property between the two bodies on the basis of the number of their adherents.

The House of Lords was led to its decision by applying the principles of trust law: it decided that the act of union had been contrary to the title-deeds of the Free Church and constituted a breach of trust. As Lord Haldane, who had been the leading counsel for the Free Church, said when the Bill of 1921 was debated in the Lords: "By a majority this House decided that the United Free Church of Scotland had turned itself in virtue of its trust-deed and declarations of doctrine into a body which could hold its property only on trust to promulgate and pursue particular doctrines of an older type than seemed to the majority suited to the time, and that to diverge from these doctrines meant the forfeiture of £2,000,000 of property, the peculiarity of which was that nearly the whole of it had been subscribed and collected by the very people from whom it was taken."

This legal decision had extremely far-reaching results, and opened the eyes of religious bodies which had hitherto believed that separation from the Established Church had secured for them freedom in matters of faith, worship and organization. It was now clear that they were threatened with the loss of their property if they departed in any respect from what might be regarded as their original principles. This was undoubtedly one of the reasons why both in Scotland and in England the agitation for Disestablishment died down and disappeared from the program of any political party. The Church of Scotland itself took alarm and secured the insertion of a clause in the Act of 1905 authorizing it to define the interpretation which it placed upon its formularies.

G. H. Stevenson.

University College,
Oxford.

(*To be concluded.*)

Tertullian and Montanism

Fragments of a treatise, written by an anonymous presbyter living in one of the cities of the Phrygian Pentapolis, are the oldest record we have of Montanism. As recorded in Eusebius, *Church History*, V, 16-7:

Their opposition and their recent schismatical heresy . . . began thus. There is reported to be a certain village in that Mysia which borders on Phrygia, called Ardabau. There it is that a recent convert to the faith named Montanus . . . in the immeasurable longing of his soul for the pre-eminence, first gave the adversary a passage into his heart; and that moved by the spirit he suddenly fell into a state of possession, as it were, and abnormal ecstasy,

insomuch that he became frenzied and began to babble and utter strange sounds, that is, contrary to the manner which the Church had received from generation to generation by tradition from the beginning. . . . He raised up two women as well, and so filled them with the spurious spirit that they too chattered in a frenzied, inopportune, and unnatural fashion. . . . When the faithful throughout Asia had met frequently and at many places in Asia for this purpose, and on examination of the newfangled teachings had pronounced them profane, and rejected the heresy, these persons were thus expelled from the Church and shut off from its communion.[1]

This account, though given by an obviously hostile writer, and one, moreover, who had probably no direct contact with Montanus or his nearest circle of followers,[2] provides us with our best beginning. The Apollonius fragments, for instance, simply bear out the facts that the inaugurators of the "new heresy" were Montanus, Maximilla and Prisc(ill)a, with Montanus as the recognized leader.

From the beginning, then, the claim of the leaders was that they were inspired by the Spirit, in accordance with the prophecy of Matt. xxiii, 34-6. Their real inspiration was not questioned by their opponents. But these claimed that the Phrygians were inspired not by the Spirit but by demons. Writings by Bishop Ælius of Deultmen in Thracia, by Origen, by Firmilian of Cæsarea, and by many other Fathers, are all concerned precisely to prove that the spirits which possess the Phrygians are spirits of falsehood and not the Spirit of Christ.

In direct opposition to this, the new movement asserts that in Montanus himself the Paraclete was present in person. This seems to have been the only doctrinal claim made by the Montanists.[3] But this did not involve—what opponents supposed—the claim that Montanus was the Holy Spirit in person; but rather that a new age had begun through the endowment of Montanus by the Spirit with the power and authority of the Paraclete promised to the faithful in the Fourth Gospel. The apostolic age was now surpassed, and an age of new achievement and glory for Christ was at hand.

Writings and oracles which were supplementary to, and indeed seem to have acquired for Montanists greater authority than, the Old and New Testaments, were poured forth, and that not only by the three leaders, but also, it is fairly certain, by many followers. The diffusion of the spirit and influence of the movement through the vast anonymous body of Christian believers is a most interesting fact, and indeed constitutes for us later observers the essential difficulty in defining the movement precisely.

Understanding of the fact of this diffusion rests upon understanding of the whole situation of the Church at this time (*i.e.*, fairly certainly the year 156, when Montanus began his prophetic mission), and in particular upon the attitude of the Church to the Spirit. It is clear that

[1] From Lawlor's translation.

[2] *Cf.* Schepelern, *Der M. und die Phrygischen Kulte*, p. 4.

[3] If indeed it may be called a doctrinal matter at all. Hippolytus, *e.g.*, says that the Montanists, "like the Church, confess the Father as God, and acknowledge the witness the Gospel gives of Christ" (*Philos.* VIII, 19, quoted by Schepelern, p. 25).

by the opposition of false prophecy to true prophecy the Church, as a whole, is living under the assumption that prophecy in ecstatic forms is valid and possible Christian experience. The conflict is not about the rightness of prophecy as such. The Spirit had hitherto been recognized as working in the most unexpected ways, and the primitive communities had to a large extent been formed and quickened by the inspiration of wandering prophets.[1] St Paul himself claimed to have the gift of tongues, a chief sign of the true prophetic inspiration. And Pentecost was a perpetual reminder to the Church of the ancient place of prophecy in its life.

The point of conflict came when utterances and attitudes, claimed as formulated under the guidance of the Spirit, conflicted with what the Church had received "from generation to generation by tradition from the beginning." The authority of the Church, which itself came from the Spirit, and which was expressed in certain established forms of doctrine, discipline, organization, and social customs, was brought into question by a movement which claimed to be also, but more authoritatively and fully, of the Spirit. Where was the criterion? Who was to say that Montanism was mere fanaticism, and prove that the Church as it had been till then had the real deposit of the Spirit's teaching? Was any possibility of advance to be shut off from the organized body of believers; and had the Church, through the very nature of its order and fixed forms, a fundamental inability to be open to advance into all truth?

These are the questions which lie across the vague amorphous situation of the Church of the second century; when Christians were no longer being born again in catastrophic breaks with their old social and religious situation, but were being led insensibly, and as a matter of course, by Christian parents into the Church.[2] The old manner of decision, with its accompanying clarity that here a truly personal and supernatural Spirit was working in the heart, and its consequences for an unrestrained and triumphant mastery of forms and organization, was disappearing; but the settling down of the Church into accommodation to the ways of the world, its relaxation of the laws about fasting and of the discipline of the lapsed, was accompanied by a vague and general discontent that things were not as they should be. What the apostles had done, and how they had done it, was surely not what this new generation was doing, and how it was finding its feet both in the world and the Church.

It was this discontent which provided the background against which the Phrygians raised their voices in the claim of special authority. The situation is not in any important sense connected with doctrine, or conflict over right statement of revealed truth. But it is pre-eminently the practical situation of the life of Christians and their relation to their world. Doctrine comes into it in so far as the matter at issue centred round a question of the working of the Spirit. But to charge the Montanists with heresy, in particular the heresy of Patripassianism, is to make a retrospective and invalid judgment. The

[1] *Cf.* Streeter's *Primitive Church.*
[2] *Cf.* Rainy's *Ancient Catholic Church*, c. 7.

fact that some Montanists, at a later stage of the movement, were Patripassians is irrelevant. The naive interchanging of the names of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost certainly hints at what was later to be the heresy of Modalism. But the period of doctrinal conflict on this point had not yet begun, and the Montanists simply illustrate a prior attitude of the *whole* Church to the nature of the Holy Spirit. The whole Church was in the same experimental, creative and open-minded state. It was only when the work of the Holy Spirit had been existentially understood—that is, by being found to work in certain ways and not in others—that the possibility of doctrinal difference emerged. The heresy which the Montanists were accused of adopting was wider, vaguer, and capable of refutation only along lines of living authority. Not the reflective utterances of theologians but the traditional insights of the mass of believers would decide what was right and what wrong amid the general unrest and apocalyptic fervour which the leaders of Montanism were not inventing but expressing.

The Montanists, then, represent one attitude to tradition, their opponents another. Though we may provisionally accept Harnack's enunciation of the principle that "whenever Montanism comes before us in the clear light of history it appears as a religion deadened, though still very powerful," it seems invalid to conclude, as he does, that in the early forms of the movement there is complete disregard of tradition. True, Montanus and the two prophetesses "proclaimed themselves as the last prophets, as notable prophets in whom was first fulfilled the promise of the sending of the Paraclete,"[1] but the clarity and authority which they claimed, however different in degree and intensity from those of the primitive prophets, remain in the direct line of Christian tradition. Dr Lawlor has shown how the controversy about the truth or falsity of the prophetic utterances of the Phrygians was probably

> an afterthought. The Catholics made much of the renzy of the prophets merely as a way of evading an argument of the Montanists which, without bringing in this other issue, was not easily disposed of. This earlier argument is revealed by the anonymous writer quoted by Eusebius. The Montanists, he says, evidently quoting from one of their books, boasted of Agabus, Judas, Silas, the daughters of Philip, Ammia of Philadelphia, and Quadrarus, and from the last two they claimed to have received the prophetic gift *by way of succession.* That is to say, they received their charismata as successors in the line of New Testament prophets, which all believed would remain until the end, just as the bishops had received their office from a line of predecessors which went back to apostolic days. They were the last prophets, no doubt; they had the gifts in a pre-eminent way; in them was fulfilled the promise of the Paraclete. All Montanist writers maintained that position. But still, they were the last and greatest *in a line of succession.*[2]

The exaggerations which accompany the claim, then, and the immediate consequences of it, cannot hide the primary fact that we have to deal with an authentic Christian situation—that is, one which is potential in the very life and constitution of Christianity, and is not

[1] Harnack, *Hist. of Dogma*, II, pp. 97 *ff.*
Eusebiana, pp. 117-8.

dependent for its origin or statement on external non-Christian factors.

To sum up what has so far been said, the principle underlying Montanus's teaching was

> that the continuance of the prophetic spirit in the Church to the time of Montanus was maintained. The Christian Church was settling down to the conviction that revelation was a thing of the past. The Scriptures were closed, and the work of the Church in regard to them was one of interpretation merely. The Church was an organization with traditions, and it was hardening into a definite mould. Against this state of things the Phrygian Church in particular was revolting. It stood for the free operation of the Spirit; and in the Montanist movement, with its doctrine of the Paraclete, and the emergence of a new order of prophets, it found an opportunity of giving expression to its own convictions.[1]

With the caveat, already discussed, that it was less a doctrine proper that was involved than a spirit of Christianity or an attitude of being to the operation of the Holy Ghost, this judgment on Phrygian Montanism is acceptable. In Hegel's dictum, "life creates organization and organization kills life."

But is this the right and necessary course for Christianity in the world? The Montanists believed that it was neither right nor, in the power of the Holy Spirit, necessary. The closing of the canon represented to them only one concrete sign of a movement towards reliance on the past which was contrary to the very promises of Christ contained in the Scriptures. To rest in this way on the forms of the past was for the Montanists treason to the revelation. The familiar conception of a once-for-all act of revelation, led up to in the Old Testament and consummated in the Incarnation, was not understood in that age as we understand it to-day.[2] The opponents of the Montanists were at a disadvantage in that they shared so many presuppositions with them. It was only slowly, as the ideas of the time clarified under the stress of controversy, that the principle underlying Montanism was decided to be at variance with Revelation, and that the Church came to the explicit belief that the work of revelation had been fixed and completed and was no more to be added to. Whether in this belief the Church abandoned anything of value which Montanus sought to preserve, either in the nature of authority or in the content of the doctrine of the Spirit, is a question we hope to be able to some extent to answer.

Any adequate account of the content of Montanus's preaching cannot be attained. The one thing certain is the dispute about prophecy. As Dr Lawlor has pointed out, it has been customary to accept Tertullian's writings as of primary authority for the understanding of Phrygian Montanism. It is, on the contrary, to be doubted whether Tertullian did not rather bring to his external acceptance of Montanus as the Paraclete all, or at least most, of those elements commonly

[1] R. E. Roberts, *Theology of Tertullian*, pp. 21 *ff.*

[2] The conception of the Incarnation as "once-for-all" and completed, is certainly to be found sketched in Tertullian. But what do we *not* find sketched in Tertullian?

accepted as Montanist. Four concrete examples illustrate the difficulty of judgment and the corresponding flimsiness of the accepted idea of Tertullian's "Montanism."

1. Did Montanus enjoin an increased observance of fasting? Tertullian certainly did: see the *De Jejuniis*. But Lawlor gives an imposing array of evidence which may well prove that "the Montanist rule in Phrygia may even, in this matter, have fallen below the standard of Phrygian Catholic custom."[1]

2. Did Montanus advocate celibacy, and an ascetic mode of life in general? The main evidence is that of Apollonius, who states that he encouraged "dissolutions of marriage" and organized his adherents with a salaried ministry and a system of "Central Offices" and a steward's office (Eusebius, *Church Hist.*, V, 18, ii). If we conclude with Lawlor that "Montanus is not primarily aiming at establishing an ascetic discipline," then once again the trend of Phrygian Montanism would seem to be away from that of the extant writings of Tertullian.

3. Montanus undoubtedly named Pepuza, with Timion, two neighbouring Phrygian villages, as the site where the New Jerusalem was to be awaited by the faithful, and summoned his adherents thither to await the Parousia. But in Tertullian we find no reference to Pepuza: he holds the orthodox Irenæan position that the kingdom of God was to be actualized "in Jerusalem, the city prepared by God, let down from heaven."[2] In general, the crude adventist expectations of the Montanists, held till the death of Maximilla, are not reproduced in the thought of Tertullian, who accepted, on the whole, the chiliastic ideas of the day. When he does talk in a more pointed way about the end, it is clearly out of his own apocalyptic sense of the imminence of persecution, or the evil of the times, rather than out of any prescribed attitude of Montanist belief.[3]

4. Women were admitted on terms of equality with men to the offices of the Montanist Church.[4] While Tertullian had naturally no difficulty in accepting women in the prophetic office, following the Apostle's word of 1 Cor. xi, 10, as we find, for instance, in the reference in *De Anima* IX to a prophetic sister in the Church at Carthage, and again in the reference in *De Virg. Vel.*, last chapter, to prophetesses, on the other hand we find him denying, with all good Catholics, that a woman may speak in church, or teach, or baptize, or assume any office which belongs to a man, least of all the priesthood.[5]

The position, then, is that Tertullian is claimed as the chief exponent of Montanism, and to him we owe most of what is claimed to be knowledge about it. Yet in almost every concrete detail we find a difference between what he teaches and what we happen to know from the meagre sources for Phrygian Montanism. The single point of connexion is Tertullian's acceptance of the authority of the "Paraclete." The various teachings about the relation of the Church to the world, and about the nature of the Church's authority, which form

[1] *Eusebiana*, pp.129-30.
[2] *Adv. Marc.* III, 24.
[3] *Cf. Ad martyros, passim*, and opening paragraphs of *De Pudicitia*.
[4] *Cf.* Lawlor, *Eusebiana*, pp. 119-20.
[5] *De Virg. Vel.* IX.

the bulk of Tertullian's so-called Montanist writings, may not, on the evidence, be specifically connected with the Phrygian movement.

Tertullian's acceptance of the authority of Montanus implies, first, a genuine common eschatological expectation, however differing in form and degree. In our own time Söderblom has written of the permanent truth for Christians of the apprehension that the kingdom of God is always at hand, "just round the corner." The division the Montanists perceived between the Church and the world is a reality for those who live in that constant awareness. But it was also a reality for those who opposed Montanus.

Second, this real connexion between Tertullian and Montanus shows that Montanism has more than a sporadic and local significance. In Bonwetsch's words: "Was the Church to assert permanently the miraculous character of its beginning, or was it to enter on a historical process of development?"[1] The question arises, What is the norm of Christian life?

One section of opponents went so far as to abandon to the care of the Montanists the Fourth Gospel and the Apocalypse, as not being the authentic work of St John. But successive synods were at pains to find a middle way. But in the end the extremists won the day and Montanism was cast out of the Catholic Church.

In this relation of Tertullian to Montanism we may perceive the inherent and tragic twofoldness of thought and attitude which has always been associated, in some form, with the Church in history. Tertullian accepted this authority of the Paraclete in what at many points seems an almost defiant spirit. At the beginning or end of a treatise there are often statements of the power and clarity of the Christian position, now that the revelation has been perfected in the teachings of Montanus. But seldom, if indeed ever, are there concrete references to the words of Montanus as settling an argument or a course of action.[2] In a significant aside in the *De Jejuniis* XII Tertullian writes: "If the Paraclete had been silent we should have been our own prophets." But his restless, inquiring mind, equalled in later history by perhaps only Augustine and Kierkegaard, needed some kind of external support and authority. This it could not find in the vague, unsettled disposition of the Church. Therefore, while Tertullian supplied clarity in his own writings on such subjects as marriage, military service, fasting, dress, attitude to persecutions, to pagan amusements and customs generally, this work only gained full significance for him when he was able to refer his readers to the visible presence of the promised Paraclete.

The authority of the Paraclete is therefore for Tertullian an authority of principle. In no matters of argument, doctrine or practice does he seem to have found the slightest aid in the oracles and writings of the Phrygians. In stating the nature of the work of the Paraclete he does not deviate from the Rule of Faith in the slightest. Thus, first

[1] *Die Gesch. d. Montanismus*, p. 154.

[2] In *De Virg. Vel.*, *e.g.*, the Paraclete is cited as saying that virgins must be veiled in church. But Tertullian goes on, typically, to prove by reason and scripture that virgins must be veiled. The authority of the Paraclete is not felt to be sufficient.

the Paraclete, having many things to teach fully which the Lord deferred till He came . . . will begin by bearing emphatic witness to Christ, as being such as we believe Him to be, together with the whole order of God the Creator, and will glorify Him. . . . And when He has been recognized as the promised Comforter on the ground of the cardinal rule, He will reveal those many things which pertain to disciplines.[1]

He states this idea of an addition to the revelation in Christ more fully in *De Virg. Vel.* I:

So, too, righteousness — for the God of righteousness and of creation is the same—was first in a rudimentary state, having a natural fear of God. From that stage it advanced through the Law and the Prophets to infancy, then through the Gospel to the fervour of youth; now through the Paraclete it is settling into maturity. He will be, after Christ, the only . . . to be called and revered as Master; for He speaks not from Himself, but what is commanded by Christ. He is the only prelate, because He succeeds Christ. They who have received Him set truth before custom.

Tertullian is here clearly not abandoning the revealed truths of the "infancy" and "youth" of Christianity. We may safely say that he would sooner abandon the teachings of the Paraclete, were they ever to conflict with the received truth. For Tertullian remains in essence orthodox to the last. This theory of stages of revelation is to be understood not so much as a doctrinal aberration as a theory, evolved under stress of circumstance, of historical criticism.

But there is another side to the attraction Tertullian felt for the Paraclete. As Monceaux says, "au fond, l'action de montanisme avait eu pour effet, non de modifier, mais d'affranchir sa pensée";[2] it liberated his thought with regard to the work of the Holy Spirit. The grand conception that the Spirit is utterly free in His workings, and that the Church is consequently a living company capable of being led into all truth, is the assumption underlying all Tertullian's work, and the assumption he saw underlying the utterances of Montanus. He was thus able to espouse the cause of Montanus, and at the same time to go on with his quite original and precious thinking on doctrinal matters, because he lived in the consciousness of the presence of the Spirit in the life and thought of the Church. This is what gives that freedom and spontaneity to his work which have only once or twice been found again in Christian thought.

But this double attraction of the authority of the Paraclete and the freedom of the Spirit Tertullian was unable to hold and live as one. His failure is the repeated failure of the Church. Either the finality of authority reached with the Paraclete puts an end to advance into truth or the freedom of the Spirit assumes the mastery. If the former, then we have again the failure of stagnation, of uninspired looking back to the dead past; if the latter, then we find crudity, licence, emotionalism, and the progressive decay which must overtake any religious society which abandons dogma and intellectual statement in favour of the undefined freedom of the Spirit.

Tertullian never abandoned his view that the Church was under

[1] *De Monog.*, c. 2.
[2] *Hist. Litt. de l'Afrique Chrétienne*, vol. i.

the immediate guidance of the Spirit.[1] But on the other hand, by seeing in the Paraclete the end to all Revelation, and at the same time inconsistently avoiding the stringency of belief in an immediate Advent, he stultified his understanding of authority. Once he saw in the Paraclete the final authority he had virtually given up the freedom of the Spirit. The story of his passage through controversy with the "Psychichi" to the final loneliness of his own position is the life comment on a false intellectual decision.

That Tertullian's connexion with the Paraclete was primarily of this intellectual order makes impossible any of the rather facile comparisons commonly made between Montanism and later sectarian revivals and religions of the "spirit." It may be, if more were known about the movement in Asia Minor, that it might be comparable with that of the Anabaptists in Münster.

The Great Church from which Tertullian finally broke away sought another solution. In general, the controversy led to the hardening of all forms, the ecclesiasticizing of the Church, the appeal to a closed canon and an authoritative and complete historical revelation, and an accommodation of the Christian ethic to the ways of the world, together with the development of a theory and practice of a stricter discipline for recalcitrantly sincere Christians. While the Holy Spirit was acknowledged to work freely, His work nevertheless was held to be fulfilled in certain defined ways, within the sacraments of the Church.

That the massive authority of the Church, with its solid appeal to history, was a more satisfying solution, because admitting more freedom, cannot now be denied. It is only when we see through Tertullian's eyes, as it were, and understand that he believed he had found the equilibrium between authority and freedom which could satisfy the full claims of the Revelation, that the difficulty and pathos of the situation are clear. Only "imbecillitas et desperatio fidei," he writes on one occasion, can pretend that the work of the Spirit is confined to one age. Yet we find him defending a position which at best adds a few more generations, a few more writings, a little bit more "revelation" and freedom, to the history of the Church. In Monceaux's words: "C'est précisément son respect de la discipline et de la tradition qui allait faire de lui un révolté." It is therefore not so surprising that his most original and independent work in dogma and in refutation of heresy seems to have been done after he had bent his intellect to the objective authority of the Paraclete. His sure sense of what was important, his sense, we might even say, of the presence of the Spirit, kept him, in all but outward ways, in the narrow and exciting path of that orthodoxy which seems to be known only to the most daring theological thinkers.

In conclusion, it should be clear that it is impossible to take sides in the controversy we have endeavoured to reconstruct. The question, stripped of its contingencies, remains a perennial question for the Church. It is not the question of sect and Church. Even in other historical situations this distinction is probably too external and un-

[1] In one passage he actually identifies the Church with the Spirit.

theological to have any fruitful possibilities. Certainly with Montanism it only skirts the problem—the place and nature of authority and the work of the Spirit. It is trivial, therefore, to attempt to compare Montanism with, say, the Buchmanite Groups. A far more helpful comparison is the one suggested by Haecker with Kierkegaard. In him we find the same tireless quest for certainty and finality, the same range of interests, the same final isolation and bitterness of expression. Kierkegaard has brought the same essential problems clear to the forefront, for the Church to-day to face. He is helping us to see the living nature of the problem which never ceased to confront Tertullian, and which became sharp and positive when the news of the coming of the Paraclete pressed into his eager mind.

Ronald Gregor Smith.

Selkirk.

A Note on the Early History of Parochial Endowments

The choice between the two suggested bases for reform—endowment of the benefice or payment of the priest[1]—cannot, of course, be settled on historical grounds alone. Nevertheless, if it can be shown that the proposal which is generally regarded as the more radical, in the sense that it would repudiate entirely the endowment system which at present obtains, is in fact so in the sense that it is the more deeply rooted in the history of Church organization and finance, then some at least, and that the more rational, of the prejudice against it may be dispelled.

It is not necessary to look back beyond the time of the Christianized Roman Empire, the fourth century A.D. At that time the bishop was the sole recipient and dispenser of all benefactions and endowments made to the Church in his diocese. "No endowments for local purposes existed; everything passed through the hands of the bishop. To his central fund the clergy looked for maintenance . . . the bishop was bound to maintain them, though he could, at his discretion, increase or diminish their allowance, and they had no appeal against his decision."[2] He paid also for the training of the clergy and the building and maintenance of churches. When the Church went out from the cathedral cities into the country around, the same dependence was maintained: the missionary priests, serving as the bishop's spiritual delegates, ministered in churches built by him on his own endowment lands, and were maintained by "precariæ," or revocable grants of the same land, to be enjoyed during their tenure of office. The grant was made to the priest, for his support; there was no thought of an endowed parish or of "security of tenure." Such churches were necessarily few, but the principle is clear.

Then trouble came: powerful laymen, "possessors" of lands, began to build churches of their own and to engage priests to serve in them.

[1] Represented respectively by the Reports of the Commission on Parochial Endowments and the books *Men, Money and the Ministry* and *Putting our House in Order*.

[2] *Cambridge Medieval History*, vi, 528 *f*.

These too were maintained by a personal and revocable grant of land—so personal that it was possible for one lord's grant to be revoked by his immediate successor. In these churches, which he had done nothing to build, the bishop was at first denied the exercise of even spiritual authority. The bishops fought this, however, and had just secured a working compromise when the barbarian invasions began. This compromise is important for our purpose; in order to secure their priests from arbitrary withdrawal of their source of maintenance, the bishop insisted that the great man might have his church—his "parochia"—only on condition that he endowed it, to secure its permanence. Parochial endowment came in, one might say, as a remedy for sin; but it is not part of the Divine Economy.

The Teuton overcame the Empire, and the Church, in time, the Teuton, but at a price. As he lay a-dying he shot his last—and that a poisoned—bolt: he left the Church with lay patronage and glebe. The pagan chief had owned the village shrine; he had received the offerings there made; and with little time to spare for religion himself, he had appointed as his delegate a priest to function on his behalf. To the priest, for his support, he had allotted a double portion in the common holding—the land shared for cultivation by the whole community. Note again: a personal assignation, even though inevitably expressed in the only fiscal idiom of the day, a share in the use of land. When the Christian priest ousted the pagan he inherited his portion ready made—his *glebe*—and his position of complete servility to the lord, his *patron*, to whom, as contemporary documents show, the church was as much a piece of property as the kitchen or a hide of land, and as much a source of income. The chief could, and did, seize his share in the temple offerings; he could not molest the priest in his portion in the common field. The priest was forced, then, to depend on land, guaranteed by the custom of the folk. The bishops, it is true, might still have clung to the old method of personal payment, but for reasons not difficult to understand they soon fell into line. To a generation or two of unspiritual bishops the authority of landlord over property would appeal more strongly than the spiritual relation of bishop and priest; and since the "old minster" priests were undoubtedly serving on the bishop's land they had no choice but to submit. Thus the system of glebe and land endowment became almost universally established. (I say "almost," because in parts of Lorraine some form of the old system did for a time survive—long enough, at least, for the earliest Cathedral Chapter at Exeter to copy from it an excellent system of bursal prebends for its canons: personal payments to men, at a fixed rate, for their maintenance, with allowances; as opposed to the variable endowment prebends found elsewhere. But that is another story.) The secular origin and development of glebe is reflected in the fact that all actions concerning "benefices" and "advowsons" (themselves technical feudal terms) were, and always have been, cognizable in the secular courts.

There remains the question of *tithe*. Its origin, as is well known, is exegetical and homiletic: "Abraham, and then all the Jews, gave tithes of all they possessed; can you do less?" By the fifth century

exegesis had reached the prophet Malachi: payment became a matter of life or death for the soul. But note: tithing began as a personal offering—any person or persons in orders, even nuns, might reap the benefit; payment was not specifically local—tithe might be bestowed anywhere. Only later, much later, through the rapacity of patrons, and for the enrichment of their own benefices (which were, of course, their absolute property at law), did tithe become permanently attached to glebe—another item of personal payment, an offering from persons to persons for their work for the Church, case-hardened into parochial endowment and absolute property. The modern treatment of the Easter Offering as a taxable source of income is almost analogous.

There, then, is the early history of parochial endowment; that it does represent a declension from primitive intentions is clear, I believe, from its treatment in later legislation. The appropriating of large portions of parochial revenues to monasteries and other corporations—which began as early as the seventh century—is commonly regarded as a scandalous thing, and so, regarding manner and motive, it sometimes was. The corporation acquired the "ecclesia," the property rights over the benefice (thereby assuming the status of its Rector), and arranged for the cure to be served by a hireling priest. Abuses there were, but that is not the point. Throughout the thirteenth century the bishops—with the English bishops honourably in the van—acting on a Canon (XXXII) of the Fourth Lateran Council of 1215, "ordained" vicarages in these appropriated benefices: they set aside, that is, part of the income as a "congrua portio" for the vicar, the priest who served the cure, giving him an assured livelihood with tenure secure. Speaking generally, the glebe and the greater tithes—*i.e.*, the permanent endowment—passed to the appropriators, and the "altarage," the personal offerings made at the altar, remained with the vicar. Throughout the Middle Ages vicarages were ordained and sometimes re-ordained; as the income of parishes rose or fell, through economic changes of local or general application, and as charges, as of hospitality, varied, so the "congrua portio" of the vicar might be readjusted, either up or down; but nearly always the "altarage" was left substantially the personal due of him who served the altar.

The conclusion is that the Church, in ordaining vicarages, was taking cognizance of the important principle that all benefactions and offerings are the property, not of the local branch of the Church to which they were made (however limited the benefactor's intention may have been), but of the Church as a whole; and that if the income of a benefice more than sufficed for the serving of its cure, the surplus might be diverted to other works of the Church—whether we agree with them *now* that all those works were worthy, or the manner or the motive worthy, being quite beside the point. I submit, therefore, that the principle of payment to the priest, according to his need, has, historically, the better pedigree; that the system of parochial endowments which now obtains represents a corruption of that principle, originating largely in pagan influence upon territorial organization, and perpetuated because of the inevitable solidarity of the Church in that organization (like our own in the system of banking and credit);

and that, in diverting revenue to Church purposes other than those intended by its donors, of which the medieval ordination of vicarages, the early Tudor diversion of chantry funds into education, and the treatment of the revenues of the See of Durham in the last century, are conspicuous examples, the Church is giving that principle overt recognition.

To accept the contention of *Men, Money and the Ministry* in this particular, then, is, historically speaking, the only truly radical course for the Church of to-day to pursue.

G. R. Dunstan.

Halifax.

BOOK REVIEWS

Divine Providence and Human Destiny. By L. E. Elliott-Binns. S.P.C.K. 4s.

This little book is an expansion of lectures delivered to a School of Clergy to which the author has added a weighty theological preface, which is the best part of the work. This accounts for a certain discrepancy of style and content, which disturbs its balance, and for the growing feeling of anticlimax which afflicts the reader after the first section has been passed.

Starting from the single, continuous revelation of Holy Scripture, Dr Elliott-Binns discusses in masterly fashion the development of the idea of Providence and of the Divine purpose for the world, in particular noting the increasing recognition of the individual's importance in its fulfilment. Hence to the Bible history is not "an eternal repetition leading nowhere," but a process with a meaning, because it is the sphere of operation of an active God. The historical books were included in the prophets, and the prophetic interpretation of events was "deductive" rather than "inductive." They appealed from God to history in the making rather than attributed a design to history already made. Thus the supreme revelation of the Bible is the *character* of the God who acts in history, one who is just and righteous and finally disclosed as Love.

Can this prophetic claim be substantiated? Dr Elliott-Binns thinks it can, but the evidence for it must be sought in history in the widest sense, as including science and philosophy. Science, it is claimed, testifies to God's power and wisdom, idealistic philosophy at least supports the view that history is the manifestation in time of the Spirit of the Universe, "history" in the narrower sense emphasizes His justice, although on the latter point there is admittedly no consensus of opinion. Again, the Second Law of Thermodynamics compels us to the view that *if* creation and history have any meaning, it must consist in the production of personal, spiritual beings not tied down to the material universe, and it is here that "immense" progress can be discerned, if a long enough view is taken.

"History tells us," then, "that we have no cause for despair." God's

plan, however, is made effective largely through the use of human agencies, and it is precisely in our waiting upon God to learn His plan that we may find, as did John Wesley, "an intense belief in an overruling Providence to which he might always commit himself." The book ends with a string of reflections upon the work of the Church and of the individual in the modern situation, often wise and timely, but in general constituting a tame conclusion to a noble theme.

HAIGH. G. E. P. COX.

TOWARDS A CHRISTIAN PHILOSOPHY. By Leonard Hodgson. Nisbet. 10s. 6d.

There is a story attached to this book. The fires of London three years ago consumed the remaining stocks of Canon Hodgson's works, among them *Essays in Christian Philosophy* (1930) and *The Grace of God in Faith and Philosophy* (1936). Out of the ashes have been rescued certain parts of these two publications, which he has "revised and corrected," and now offers as "pointing the way for philosophers and theologians alike." The result has both the interest and drawbacks of theological salvage.

The interest of the book centres on its autobiographical character, which is made explicit in the Preface: "The publication of this book . . . is a gesture of middle-age," for "we of middle-age cannot welcome back the things against which we revolted in our fathers" (*i.e.*, presentation of "the truths of Christianity either with the authority of an infallible Church or book, or with the clarity of a Cartesian demonstration") "in order to ingratiate ourselves with our sons" (namely, by allowing that "anything in Wittgenstein or Barth invalidates" the principles of this book). Therefore, as a specimen of what thoughtful Christians used to say during the individualistic, optimistic, leisurely inter-war period this collection of essays is a useful guide. But it keeps within the limits imposed by the preposition in the title, and suggests no proud claims: "The view-taster may be a promising student, but it is the mark of maturity to have passed beyond that stage, and to be once again a devotee of truth" (p. 36). And it does not adventure far into the region of the crusading missionary, where theologians of the future may have to live.

Absence of internal unity makes any composite volume difficult to read. When the author speaks of "writing this book" (p. 37) or "a subsection of one lecture in this course" (p. 187, n. 1), does he mean *The Essays*, *The Grace of God etc.*, or this republication? The reader has to make up his own mind. One slogan, however, does give a rough shape to the book—"faith must philosophize." It is bravely said, and more than once (pp. 26, 133, 151, 161). Perhaps it could have been more clearly said if as much attention as admiration had been given to the *philosophia perennis* of the "great tradition" (see Chapter III).

A careful reader will treasure this book for several helpful sayings which occur in the course of the arguments.

W. W. S. MARCH.

RELIGION AND POLITICS. By Charles Smyth. S.P.C.K. 1s.

This is a most valuable and admirable pamphlet. I hope I may be pardoned (certainly by the author and perhaps by his readers) for thinking that its especial value lies in its sound historical content, which is used to illuminate the present situation and to convey warning against potential dangers. Thus Canon Smyth enforces by telling quotation the historical tradition in Anglicanism of the right of the Church to concern itself with society, showing thereby that the present Primate is not an innovator in his emphasis upon this aspect of the Church's duty. More strikingly, perhaps, the duty of the Church to exercise the function of the conscience of the nation is derived from its national establishment. Upon this point Canon Smyth has much of importance to say. It is interesting to notice that Mr Christopher Dawson concurs in this point by his affirmation (valuable as coming from this source) that "a State which possesses an established Church obviously does not have to create its own spiritual ideals or its own moral standards, for these things are already given in the Church." At the same time Canon Smyth brings out clearly the importance, in considering the relations between Church and State, of the distinction between *potestas ordinis* and *potestas jurisdictionis*, a point which is illustrated most clearly in the controversy which centred in the Non-Juror schism.

Perhaps the most significant feature of the pamphlet is the author's insistence upon the value of an established Church. "That the national establishment of the Christian religion should be Anglican is, in my judgment, an important but yet a secondary consideration; in Scotland, for example, it is Presbyterianism that is established. But that there should be a national establishment of the Christian religion is, as I believe, of paramount importance. . . . I have for some time thought —and the evidence of the archbishop's remarks rather confirms me in this apprehension—that where contemporary Anglican theology is defective is not in its doctrine of the Church, but in its doctrine of the State." What a very Warburtonian position! The present reviewer must indeed rub his eyes with astonished delight to read such sentiments from a quarter which has never been suspected of Erastianism.

In the penultimate section of his pamphlet Canon Smyth makes bold to utter a timely warning and protest against certain dangers and misinterpretations of the Primate's position. "Is it not of some importance to avoid creating the impression that social righteousness is a monopoly of the left, and social obliquity of the right?" Undoubtedly there has been much perversion of the archbishop's standpoint, and Canon Smyth has done a valuable service in emphasizing this point. Moreover, as he finely observes, history provides many examples of the dangers of allowing the recognition of the duty of the Church to concern itself with the problems of society to degenerate into a virtual identification of the kingdom of God with an earthly polity. "My kingdom is not of this world" remains a pregnant principle as well as a much-quoted text. A great deal of historical knowledge is combined with many wise saws and modern instances in this pamphlet which may be commended cordially and with grateful thanks to the author.

OXFORD. NORMAN SYKES.

SHORTER NOTICES

How Christians Worship. S.C.M. Press. 2s. 6d.
Alternative Form of Holy Communion (S. Africa). S.P.C.K. 3s. 6d.
Mother of Jesus. By G. D. Carleton. Pax House. 4s. 6d.
God be in My Head. By E. D. Sedding. Mowbray. 2s. 6d.

How Christians Worship is a collection of Broadcast Talks worth publishing, worth the ordinary Christian's reading for the development of his own grasp of what our worship is and should be, and for his preparation for the knitting together of shattered Christendom. Mr Ratcliff's address is especially deserving of admiration. The book contains the story of the distortion of the Eucharist into the medieval Mass, and of the gropings and thrusts to get back to proportion and fulness. It may be said that nearly all the fish are now in the net, but it needs an auspicious movement in the Church of Christ to land these fish and cook them, producing the foundation dish of the Meal for all, though eaten with various local sauces. Where small groups meet for discussion and sociability, this book will provide good matter for reading and talking over. O ye Christian cells, devour it.

The Ordinary of the South African Eucharist is published by the Alcuin Club in *Anglican Liturgies*. But in this book of the pocket, $6 \times 3\frac{1}{2}$ ins., we have in addition the Propers; and that is its interest: "An Alternative Form of—The Holy Communion and Alternative Collects, Epistles and Gospels, set forth by authority for use in the Church of the Province of South Africa, where allowed by the Bishop, 1942." It is the Proper of 1662 revised and enlarged. No doubt the daily Eucharist is the force which has produced it, and I suppose this edition is for the layman who goes on weekdays. A number of Anglican holy folk may be commemorated by a collect. The Ordinary is rightly printed in the middle of the book; but the Propers for Sundays and Great Feasts go before, and those of Lesser Feasts and Fasts, Commons and Occasionals come after. It would seem better to have had a Calendar at the beginning of the book, and the Temporale before the Ordinary, and the Sanctorale, etc., after it. The worshipper could then with ease use the book with the help of a couple of markers. It may be noted that June 29 is the day of SS. Peter and Paul. That is all to the good. The Commemoration of the Holy Communion is put down for the Thursday after Trinity Sunday. It is well to avoid the medieval misnomer, Corpus Christi, but the Anglican interpretation of this feast is still in a caterpillar stage. When it emerges to maturity, and when the relation between Baptism and Eucharist is clarified, I suspect that "At a thanksgiving for the institution of Holy Baptism" will disappear. The South African Province is still, like other parts of the Anglican Communion, feeling its way with respect to Blessed Mary. There is a Proper, all right but not inspired, for August 15. But August 15 is a Lesser Feast and September 8 is a Greater Feast. August 15 needs to be a greater Feast—the Repose—with an octave like June 29, Michaelmas and All Saints in this book.

It is doubtful if anything is needed on September 8 and December 8. There is no Table of Directions about what to do when Feasts concur.

Mr Carleton's book, *Mother of Jesus*, tackles an important problem for reunion, the nature of the devotion of Christians for Blessed Mary. Eighteen chapters, ninety-three pages, a pleasing exposition of what we may call the "Catholist" position and temper in these matters. But all is not dogma, that is stated clearly and dogmatically. Tradition is allowed to include pious speculation absorbed into the thought and religiosity of Western Christendom. The book lives down an historical cul-de-sac. It is not so useful as Phyllis Graham's *The Loveliest Lady*. The book that is needed on this theme will have to face such problems as: (1) Is there any justification for declaring Blessed Mary superior to the angels in a sense that all the redeemed in Christ are not? (2) Is there any justification for the exaltation of Blessed Mary over all other Christ's holy ones? (3) Can it be said that from the New Testament standpoint her vocation is greater than that, say, of Peter, Paul or John? (4) Is not this desire to grade sub-Christian? (5) Is not Blessed Mary to be revered and loved as one of the Family? Like the Baptist she stands at the Dawn of the New Day and will constantly be in our thoughts for this reason. (6) Is not the Anglican standpoint Apostrophe rather than what is known as the Invocation of Saints? What is needed is a delight in and love of Blessed Mary, not rooted in definitions about her beyond the Scriptural limits, definitions springing from overbold declaration of what is congruous.

Fr Sedding's Retreat Addresses to boys, *God be in My Head*, make a good book: yes, for the secondary schoolboy a while after his confirmation. There is much stirring of adolescent intellectual curiosity and of pondering of what can be done with our mortal days. It is full of the riches of the European culture, but it does not tackle the outlook of the industrial and machine world, in which boys have now to find their bearings. Unfortunately it gives the impression that all was right with the Christianity of England up to the sixteenth century, but that then the waters of life in the land became the merest trickle. Well, this outlook is something also with which the modern boy has got to come to grips. Yet it is delightful and good, this book. Many things are, that are as well lopsided.

ROBERT P. SYMONDS.

CROYLAND.

The Holy Communion, by Canon Spencer Leeson (Longmans, 2s. 6d.), is described by the Bishop of London in a foreword as a devotional study of the Holy Communion and as concerned primarily with "the spiritual truths which unite"; this aim Canon Leeson has attempted to achieve by treating almost every subject in terms solely of religious experience, and decrying a precisely theological approach to the service. In spite of a few protestations concerning the need for objectivity, such statements as these set the tone of the book: "Hereby we know that in its deepest essence man's nature is divine, because it is in this Sacrament that God's saints have in all ages found their final satisfaction" (p. 55), "the saints in all ages . . . have felt themselves in a literal sense to be saved by the blood of Christ" (p. 42, and we are

not surprised in the sentence following to find the service described as "the fruit of centuries of devotional insight"). In accordance with this spirit, his account of the relation of the service of Holy Communion to the Atonement displays a baffling eclecticism. His view of the Atonement is fundamentally the Moral Theory (pp. 44-60); Christ's sacrifice overcame moral evil for us, thereby evoking our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving; any other theory of our identification with Christ's sacrifice is "in danger of sinking to some such gross and earthy notion as mechanical satisfaction, and even magic" (p. 48). But is "we have become united with Him by the likeness of His death" of Romans vi, 5, really in such danger as this? Canon Leeson goes on to describe the doctrine of the New Covenant established by our Lord in which the members of Christ's Church find reconciliation with God, and then expounds the communion with God enjoyed by the Church in this Sacrament as one which benefits exclusively the soul, his preoccupation with Platonic philosophy allowing him to ignore the redemption of the body and the very plain words of the Prayer Book, "preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life." In his desire to find "the spiritual truths which unite," Canon Leeson has permitted theological consistency and any objective approach to his subject to be almost crowded out of his study.

On p. 50 of his book, *The Seven Golden Candlesticks* (Mowbray, 2s. 6d.), Canon Peter Green tackles the doctrine of the identification of the Christian soul with Christ's sacrifice much more realistically, since he understands the condemnation which the Cross brings, in a way which Canon Leeson does not. Indeed his whole book is an attempt to bring into prominence such doctrines as the sinfulness of human nature, the redemption of the body, and the Second Coming of Christ, of which theologians and preachers until quite recently have fought shy. But his presentation of these doctrines is only the old Evangelical approach clothed in a rather attractive modern dress, and he has a pathetic belief in the power of hymns to resuscitate unpopular dogma, and the capacity of science to illustrate theological truth. He does not seem to realize the existence of such schools as the Neo-Calvinists nor of the "Signpost" set (who in spite of their adolescent love of theological jargon do represent a heartening and satisfying return to a dogmatic Christianity), or of such a revival of interest in eschatology as that led by Dr C. H. Dodd.

In *The Theology of Missions* (S.C.M. Press, 2s. 6d.), the Rev. Geoffrey Allen publishes his Godfrey Day Memorial lectures delivered in 1942 in Trinity College, Dublin, a brief but useful survey of that new field of theology which is by some miscalled "Missiology" (why not "Apostology"?); it is marred only occasionally by the writer's tendency to interpret theology according to the Hegelian scheme of thesis, antithesis, and synthesis. *More Sermons from Margaret Street* (Mowbray, 3s. 6d.) presents a rich and mellow assortment of the later sermons and addresses of Dom Bernard Clements.

R. P. C. Hanson.

Dublin.

Printed in Great Britain by
Billing and Sons Ltd., Guildford and Esher